



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/662,772	09/15/2003	Ronald P. Doyle	RSW920030174US1	2183

23550 7590 02/03/2009
HOFFMAN WARNICK LLC
75 STATE STREET
14TH FLOOR
ALBANY, NY 12207

EXAMINER

WAI, ERIC CHARLES

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2195

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

02/03/2009

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTOCommunications@hoffmanwarnick.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/662,772	Applicant(s) DOYLE ET AL.	
	Examiner ERIC C. WAI	Art Unit 2195	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 October 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-11,13,15 and 17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-11, 13, 15, and 17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 3-11, 13, 15, and 17 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1, and 3-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- a. The following terms are not clearly understood:

- i. Claim 1 lines 5-7 recite, “the attributes comprising a demand for another service in the plurality of services and at least one attribute of a resource of the system”. It is unclear how the attributes can comprise both a demand and at least one attribute (i.e. does the attribute comprise another attribute?).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and

Art Unit: 2195

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 3-11, 13, 15, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aziz et al. (US Pat No. 6,597,956).

6. Regarding claim 1, Aziz discloses a method of managing resources in a system, the method comprising:

determining a demand for a service in a plurality of services being provided using a plurality of software servers in the system, wherein the plurality of services share the resources of the system (col 5 lines 7-8, 13-17, wherein the computing grid is logically divided based on demand for services provided for that organization's virtual server farm; col 7 lines 55-54, wherein resources are shared);

determining attributes of the system on the image server, and at least one attribute of a resource of the system, the resource comprising one of: a software server, the image server, a network, or a storage system (col 5 lines 13-17, wherein the allocation is performed based on real time demand and other factors); and

provisioning resources for the service based on the demands and at least one attribute of a resource using the image server (col 5 lines 13-17, wherein the allocation of physical computer resources is performed).

7. Aziz does not teach the determining and provisioning occurs on the image server. However, it would have been obvious to utilize a server in the system of Aziz to perform such functions. One would be motivated by the desire to have a means to perform the steps taught by Aziz.

Art Unit: 2195

8. Aziz also does not explicitly teach the attributes comprising a demand for another service in the plurality of services. However, Aziz is directed towards the use of multiple virtual server farms that are simultaneously executed on a computing grid. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Aziz to also factor the demands on other virtual server farms (i.e. demand for other services). One would be motivated by the desire to take into account the demands of others since the resource pools are shared.

9. Regarding claim 3, Aziz does not teach that the resources comprise at least one software server, and wherein the at least one attribute comprises a software status of the at least one software server.

10. Aziz considers the services provided by various nodes in a network of computers. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a software server and its status. Therefore, one would be motivated by the desire to include software servers in the network of computers of Aziz.

11. Regarding claim 4, Aziz does not teach that the attribute comprises a cache state of the at least one software server.

12. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include provisioning resources based on a cache state. One would be motivated by the desire for more efficient use of resources by reducing the necessity to replenish the cache with new data.

13. Regarding claim 5, Aziz does not explicitly teach that the attribute comprises a time period required to provision at least one of the resources for the service.

14. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to factor in a time period required to provision a resource into the cost of doing so. One would be motivated by the desire to increase profits and efficiency.

15. Regarding claim 6, Aziz teaches that the attribute comprises a load on the image system (col 5 lines 13-17, real time demand).

16. Regarding claims 7-10, Aziz teaches the method as claimed in claims 1, and 3-6.

17. Regarding claim 11, 13, and 15, they are the system claims of claims 1, and 3-6 above. Therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 1, and 3-6 above.

18. Regarding claim 17, it is the program product claim of claims 1 above. Therefore, it is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 above.

Response to Arguments

19. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

20. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eric C. Wai whose telephone number is 571-270-1012. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs, 9am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng - Ai An can be reached on 571-272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/VAN H NGUYEN/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2194

/Eric C Wai/
Examiner, Art Unit 2195